GC

GC(42)/COM.5/OR.2
21 October 1998
GENERAL Distr.

International Atomic Energy Agency
GENERAL CONFERENCE

Original: ENGLISH

FORTY-SECOND (1998) REGULAR SESSION

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE SECOND MEETING

Held at the Austria Center Vienna
on Wednesday, 23 September 1998, at 10.20 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. JOSEPH (Australia)

CONTENTS

Item of the agenda*		Paragraphs
11	Scale of assessment of Members' contributions towards the Regular Budget	1 - 2
12	Measures to strengthen international co-operation in nuclear, radiation and waste safety	3 - 74
13	Strengthening of the Agency's technical co-operation activities	75 - 105

[*] GC(42)/20.

For reasons of economy, this document has been printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their own copies of documents to meetings.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC(42)/INF/13/Rev.3.

98-03412 (XXXVII)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, in a memorandum and/or incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent to the Division of Languages, International Atomic Energy Agency, Wagramerstrasse 5, P.O. Box 100, A-1400 Vienna, Austria. Corrections should be submitted within three weeks of the receipt of the record.

Abbreviations used in this record

GRULAC	Latin American and Caribbean Group
INSAG	International Nuclear Safety Advisory Group
MERCOSUR	Southern Cone Common Market
OPANAL	Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean
SAGTAC	Standing Advisory Group on Technical Assistance and Co-operation
TCDC	Technical co-operation among developing countries
TCF	Technical Co-operation Fund

SCALE OF ASSESSMENT OF MEMBERS' CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARDS THE REGULAR BUDGET
(GC(42)/13)

1. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution on page 3 of document GC(42)/13.

2. It was so agreed.

MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN NUCLEAR, RADIATION AND WASTE SAFETY
(GC(42)/11, GC(42)/INF/3, 5, 6, 14 and 15, GC(42)/COM5/5, 7, 8 and 9)

3. The CHAIRMAN, drawing attention to document GC(42)/INF/15, which dealt with the International Conference on the Safety of Radiation Sources and the Security of Radioactive Materials that had taken place in Dijon, France, the previous week, invited Mr. Beninson of Argentina, who had chaired the Conference Programme Committee, to take the floor.

4. Mr. BENINSON (Argentina) said that each year numerous radiation sources recorded in the inventories of regulatory bodies were lost, abandoned or stolen and that in addition there were a great many radiation sources not recorded in the inventory of any regulatory body. Such "orphan" sources could become the subject of illicit trafficking or change hands quite legally, but in either event they could give rise to accidents or incidents.

5. A recent incident caused by an "orphan" source had been the release of a radioactive plume from a plant in Spain where scrap metal was melted down; one batch of scrap metal had included an "orphan" source, and the radioactive plume had been detected by radiation monitoring stations a long way off.

6. It was important to prevent radiation sources from eluding regulatory control and to monitor their movement. In particular, it was important to be able to detect radiation sources as they were crossing national borders - legally or illegally.

7. The Conference, which had examined various issues relating to "orphan" sources, had - inter alia - urged governments to create regulatory authorities for radiation sources if they did not already exist and recommended that further efforts be made to investigate whether international undertakings concerned with the effective operation of national regulatory control systems and attracting broad adherence could be formulated.

8. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of Turkey to introduce the draft resolution contained in document GC(42)/COM.5/5 and relating to the safety of transport of radioactive materials.

9. Mr. ARAR (Turkey), introducing the draft resolution (which Yemen wished to co-sponsor), said that in the Diplomatic Conference convened to adopt the Joint Convention

on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management there had been a serious difference of views about Article 27 of the Joint Convention, which related to "transboundary movement". After lengthy discussions, the Diplomatic Conference had adopted a resolution in which it urged all States parties to the Joint Convention to take into full consideration the Agency's Regulations for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Material (the Agency's Transport Regulations) when formulating and implementing their national laws and regulations. Subsequently, the General Conference had - in resolution GC(41)/RES/12 - requested the Secretariat to prepare "a report on legally binding and non-binding international instruments and regulations concerning the safe transport of radioactive materials and their implementation" for consideration during the Board's meetings in June 1998. That report was contained in document GOV/1998/17, and the Board had taken note of it during its June meetings.

10. The report revealed that many international instruments and regulations of varying scope and type existed, but the co-authors of the draft resolution were of the opinion that the Agency's Transport Regulations were the only really relevant document - but they were legally non-binding.

11. The draft resolution aimed at achieving wider and more effective implementation of the Agency's Transport Regulations, and he hoped that it would attract a consensus, with Member States setting aside short-term economic interests.

12. Mr. CHEBIHI (Algeria) said that he too hoped that the draft resolution would attract a consensus.

13. Mr. TRUJILLO GARCIA (Colombia), speaking on behalf of GRULAC and expressing support for the draft resolution, said that the transport of radioactive materials was a subject of great concern to GRULAC's members, as was clear from - inter alia - the 5 February 1998 OPANAL declaration on the transport of radioactive waste, the 29 October 1997 declaration of the member countries and associated countries of MERCOSUR and the joint declaration on radioactive waste signed by Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Uruguay on 17 January 1997. The member countries of GRULAC therefore attached particular importance to the Agency's Transport Regulations, and several had adopted them as the basis for their national regulations relating to the transport of radioactive materials.

14. Mr. MORTON (New Zealand) said that, like many other coastal States, New Zealand was deeply concerned about the safety of transport of radioactive materials. A communiqué released in August by the South Pacific Forum showed the strength of feeling which existed on that issue in the South Pacific region.

15. The draft resolution was not designed to impose restrictions on those countries which engaged in the transport of radioactive materials, and he hoped that they would support it.

16. At the same time, he was disappointed that the submission of such a draft resolution seemed to be the only type of action currently possible within the Agency and felt that shipping States could and should do more to meet the concerns of coastal States.

17. Mr. BOURITA (Morocco), inviting broad support for the draft resolution, said that Morocco - situated on the Strait of Gibraltar - received SOS calls every day from passing ships. Accidents involving such ships with radioactive materials on board could pose a radiological threat to his country.

18. Mr. SHOAIB (Pakistan), expressing support for the draft resolution, said that hardly any radioactive waste or other radioactive materials were moved by land or sea within, to or from his country and that the air transport of such materials was conducted in accordance with the Agency's Transport Regulations, which provided a sound basis for national regulations.

19. Mr. STRATFORD (United States of America), having expressed appreciation of the Secretariat report submitted to the Board in document GOV/1998/17, said that his Government was concerned about the apparent desire of some Member States to make the Agency's Transport Regulations legally binding. Accordingly, his delegation could not go along with operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

20. For domestic legal reasons, the United States, which had incorporated much of the Agency's Transport Regulations into its relevant federal regulations, had not incorporated them in their entirety. Regulating the transport of radioactive materials was a national responsibility, and making the Agency's Transport Regulations legally binding mandatory would reinforce the erroneous view that the Agency was an international regulator.

21. The existing legally binding and non-binding international instruments and regulations were sufficient, and scarce Agency resources should not be expended on exercises of the type envisaged in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

22. Mr. KNYAZHNYTSKY (Ukraine) said that his country had - as a transit State - concluded a number of international agreements relating to the transboundary movement of radioactive materials and that it was satisfied with the resulting arrangements. Consequently, it did not feel the need for any new international instrument. It would prefer to see the focus placed on improving the implementation of existing international instruments.

23. Mr. TOWLER (United Kingdom) said that the position of his country was similar to that of the United States. The United Kingdom had leaned heavily on the Agency's Transport Regulations when formulating its relevant national regulations, but it had not adopted them all.

24. His delegation was concerned that adoption of the draft resolution as it stood might lead to a duplication of work which was being done by other organizations, and it could therefore not support the draft resolution.

25. Mr. DELACROIX (France) said that in his country's view the Agency's Transport Regulations should remain legally non-binding. Adoption of the draft resolution would be a step towards making them binding, and his delegation could therefore not support it.

26. Mr. TITKOV (Russian Federation) said that the international transport of radioactive materials was comprehensively covered by existing international instruments. Hence, the idea of developing - under the Agency's auspices - a convention on the safe transport of nuclear materials had not been widely supported in the Diplomatic Conference convened to adopt the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management.

27. An attempt was now being made, with the draft resolution, to achieve the same ultimate objective by making the Agency's Transport Regulations legally binding and the Agency a supranational body authorized to monitor individual States' compliance with them. His delegation could therefore not support the draft resolution.

28. Use of the Agency to modify international law in areas not directly or exclusively connected with the utilization of nuclear energy and attempts to involve the Agency in extraneous political issues were totally unacceptable.

29. Mr. ARAR (Turkey) said that countries like the United States and the United Kingdom might have difficulties with submitting declarations of the kind envisaged in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, but he did not think such difficulties were insuperable.

30. The co-authors were not, as the representative of the Russian Federation had suggested, attempting to turn the Agency into a supranational body authorized to monitor individual States' compliance with the Agency's Transport Regulations.

31. Mr. RAGHURAMAN (India) said that Indian experts had participated in the development - under the Agency's auspices - of safety standards which, although not binding on States (including India), served as a basis for national legislation and regulations.

32. The work of the various advisory bodies set up by the Secretariat to develop and review nuclear safety, radiation safety, waste safety and transport safety standards and of groups like INSAG was greatly appreciated by his country.

33. The Secretariat should continue to promote nuclear safety and waste safety by disseminating information on the available state-of-the-art technologies. A nuclear incident anywhere was a nuclear incident everywhere, so technical support for safety improvements should not be hampered by political considerations.

34. The Agency should also help developing countries interested in embarking on nuclear power programmes to deal with the mass of safety standards which had been developed. In that connection, it might be useful to explore the possibility of conducting regional and interregional safety training courses in developing countries within the framework of TCDC.

35. An interregional group training course on radiation protection and safety in medicine, organized with the Agency's help, had been held in India earlier in the year within the framework of a model technical co-operation project, and an "IAEA Regional Basic

Professional Training Course on Radiation Protection" was due to take place there shortly. His delegation would like such courses to be held annually.

36. Calling for an integrated approach to nuclear safety, he said that proper provision for safety already at the facility design stage helped to reduce costs - a point of particular importance for developing countries interested in the possibilities of nuclear power. In that connection, the Agency should play a proactive role globally in promoting safety culture and assist Member States in acquiring nuclear safety technology.

37. Mr. FRASK LUCERO (Brazil), inviting support for the draft resolution, said his country believed that the international regime governing the transport of radioactive materials should be gradually strengthened.

38. Like all other MERCOSUR countries, Brazil had already incorporated the Agency's Transport Regulations into its national regulations and was applying them in the transport of all kinds of radioactive material, both internally and internationally.

39. Mr. BOBADILLA LÓPEZ (Chile), also inviting support for the draft resolution, said that his country, with its very extensive coastline, was well aware of - and extremely concerned about - the risks associated with the transport of radioactive materials.

40. His delegation would like all States shipping radioactive materials to provide the potentially affected States with information about the routes to be followed and about contingency plans for dealing with accidents.

41. Mr. KEMPEL (Austria) said that the draft resolution was in principle a useful one and that the concerns of countries located close to major transport routes were understandable. However, the question whether the Agency's Transport Regulations should become legally binding was a difficult one. For its part, his country believed that they should continue to be non-binding, it being left to individual States to implement them in what was for them the most appropriate manner.

42. Referring to operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, which envisaged the establishment of a service by the Secretariat, he recalled that Rule 67 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference stated that a proposal involving expenditure by the Agency "shall not be voted upon in the absence of a report ... on the administrative and financial implications ...".

43. Mr. SARWAT (Egypt), expressing support for the draft resolution, said that, although concerns relating to national sovereignty in the safety area and to the possibility of additional costs having to be borne by the Agency were legitimate, the concerns of States likely to be affected by the radioactive material shipping operations of other States should take precedence. The international nuclear safety regime should be strengthened just as the international safeguards regime had been.

44. Mr. MOONEY (Ireland) said that in his view the draft resolution was acceptable to the extent that it responded to public concerns about the transport of radioactive materials. However, operative paragraph 1 seemed to envisage the Agency's policing regulatory activities of other organizations - something about which he had misgivings.

45. Mr. CASTERTON (Canada) said that his delegation would not want the Agency to duplicate the work of other organizations, but it would like to see a greater flow of information to the Agency. The flow would be augmented if Member States which had not yet responded to the questionnaire used by the Secretariat in preparing the report contained in the Attachment to document GOV/1998/17 did respond, indicating in particular the use which they were making of the Agency's Transport Regulations.

46. The safe transport of radioactive materials was a complex issue involving many aspects of international law, and in his delegation's view the draft resolution as it stood prejudged the outcome of future Agency work relating to that issue.

47. Mr. YAMANAKA (Japan), endorsing what had been said by the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the Russian Federation, said that his delegation was particularly concerned about the request made of the Director General in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. It was difficult to see how the Director General could "determine the extent" to which other international organizations had "adopted the revised Transport Regulations ...".

48. His delegation was also concerned about the way in which the information contained in the national declarations envisaged in operative paragraph 2 would be used.

49. Mr. PECSTEEN (Belgium) endorsed what had been said by the representative of the United States, France, the United Kingdom, the Russian Federation and Japan.

50. Mr. PAPADIMITROPOULOS (Greece) said that, while the co-authors of the draft resolution were to be commended for their tireless efforts, their purpose in submitting the draft resolution at the present time - after what had happened during the negotiations on the Convention on Nuclear Safety and in the Diplomatic Conference convened to adopt the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management - was difficult to understand.

51. His delegation shared the concerns expressed by the representatives of Japan and various other Member States, including the concern about the administrative and financial implications of the request made of the Secretariat in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

52. Mr. STRATFORD (United States of America), recalling that the Convention on Nuclear Safety and the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management provided for peer review processes designed to determine how the obligations established in the Conventions were being fulfilled, said that during the negotiations on the Joint Convention it had been decided that the transport of

radioactive materials would not be covered in that instrument; many countries had simply not been prepared to accept peer reviews of the fulfilment of obligations relating to the transport of radioactive materials.

53. The draft resolution envisaged something akin to a peer review process, however, and many countries, when making the declarations provided for in operative paragraph 2 would simply state that - for reasons of their own - they had not formulated and were not implementing "national laws and regulations in whose formulation and implementation they took and are taking full account of the Transport Regulations ...". That was something which most of those countries would not like to be forced to do by a number of other countries.

54. Mr. GONZÁLEZ (Director, Division of Radiation and Waste Safety), responding to remarks about the administrative and financial implications of the Secretariat's establishing the service envisaged in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, said that Member States requesting appraisals of how they were implementing the Agency's Transport Regulations would normally pay for the appraisals to be carried out. Alternatively, such appraisals could be carried out within the framework of technical co-operation projects or by cost-free experts made available by other Member States.

55. As regards operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, the Director General was already doing something on the lines of what seemed to be envisaged there within the framework of the Agency's normal co-operation with other international organizations.

56. The CHAIRMAN suggested that further discussion of the draft resolution contained in document GC(42)/COM.5/5 be postponed until interested delegations had had time for informal consultations.

57. It was so agreed.

58. Mr. SCHMIDT (Austria), introducing the draft resolution on the Convention on Nuclear Safety in document GC(42)/COM.5/7, said that in preambular paragraph (c) the number "46" should be changed to "47".

59. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the Conference the adoption of that draft resolution.

60. It was so agreed.

61. Mr. BENINSON (Argentina), introducing the draft resolution in document GC(42)/COM.5/8 on the International Conference on the Safety of Radiation Sources and the Security of Radioactive Materials held in Dijon, France, from 14 to 18 September 1998, pointed out that it contained references to "illicit trafficking in radioactive materials" - something covered in the draft resolution contained in document GC(42)/COM.5/6 on "Measures against illicit trafficking in nuclear materials and other radioactive sources". He would be amenable to any drafting suggestions aimed at avoiding duplication between the two draft resolutions.

62. Mr. MCINTOSH (Australia) said that he too would be amenable to such drafting suggestions.

63. As regards operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution in document GC(42)/COM.5/8, it might be more appropriate if the Secretariat were requested "to prepare for the consideration of the Board of Governors a report on ..." rather than "to explore ...".

64. Mr. CASTERTON (Canada) suggested that, in order to avoid duplication between the draft resolution in document GC)42)/COM.5/8 and that in document GC(42)/COM.5/6, the references to illicit trafficking in radioactive materials be deleted from the former. Thus, in operative paragraph 2 the phrase ", including efforts to prevent, detect and respond to illicit trafficking in radioactive materials" would be deleted; in operative paragraph 3 the phrase ", including systems for preventing, detecting and responding to illicit trafficking in radioactive materials" would be deleted; and in paragraph 4 the phrase "and for preventing, detecting and responding to illicit trafficking in radioactive materials" would be deleted.

65. Mr. BENINSON (Argentina) said he could go along with the suggestion made by the representative of Canada and also accept the modification of operative paragraph 4 suggested by the representative of Australia.

66. Mr. SCHMIDT (Austria) said that operative paragraph 1 seemed to suggest that the General Conference would be endorsing the major findings of a conference which had taken place only a few days previously.

67. The CHAIRMAN suggested that further consideration of the draft resolution be postponed.

68. It was so agreed.

69. Mr. STOIBER (United States of America), introducing the draft resolution in document GC(42)/COM.5/9 on "Measures to address the Year 2000 (Y2K) issue", said that the "millennium bug" existed in a variety of unexpected places and could affect important control and management systems. Decisive action was needed in order to ensure that critical systems at nuclear facilities were corrected well before the year 2000. Because the ability to address the Y2K issue differed substantially from one Member State to another, the Secretariat should act as "a clearing-house and central point of contact for Member States to exchange information".

70. As regards the phrase "within existing resources" in operative paragraph 3, his country was ready to provide expert assistance free of charge to the Agency.

71. In response to a comment by the Chairman, he said that in operative paragraph 4 the phrase "that Member State information" should read "the information provided by Member States".

72. Mr. TOWLER (United Kingdom), inviting support for the draft resolution, said that his delegation welcomed the readiness of the United States to provide the Agency with assistance free of charge.

73. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(42)/COM.5/9.

74. It was so agreed.

STRENGTHENING OF THE AGENCY'S TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ACTIVITIES (GC(42)/INF/4, GC(42)/COM.5/3)

75. Mr. CRONJE (South Africa), introducing the draft resolution in document GC(42)/COM.5/3 on behalf of the Group of 77, said that the text was basically the same as that of resolution GC(41)/RES/13, adopted in 1997, with a number of additions.

76. Mr. KEMPEL (Austria) suggested that the Committee go through the additions one by one.

77. Ms. ALEMAYEHU (Ethiopia) said that the Agency's technical co-operation activities were of paramount importance to developing countries, and especially to the least developed among them. The technical assistance her country had received from the Agency had contributed considerably to its development endeavours, and it appreciated the continuing efforts being made by the Department of Technical Co-operation to deliver an effective programme despite a drop in resources.

78. Mr. RAGHURAMAN (India) said his delegation was pleased with the high level of implementation achieved by the Department of Technical Co-operation despite the non-availability of expected resources. It hoped that the Department's new organizational structure would help in strengthening the Agency's technical co-operation activities.

79. His delegation welcomed the management reform initiatives which had been taken. It also welcomed SAGTAC's recommendation that activities in the technical co-operation field financed from both the TCF and the Regular Budget be integrated; implementation of that recommendation would probably help in areas like nuclear power, nuclear safety and nuclear applications.

80. His delegation appreciated the steps being taken to strengthen TCDC by involving the more advanced institutions in the different regions and through the "centres of excellence" approach.

81. India was concerned at the recent tendency to focus increasingly on verification. There should be a proper balance in the allocation of resources between promotional and safeguards activities.

82. During the 1970s and early 1980s, projects relating to nuclear power and the nuclear fuel cycle had accounted for some 30% of the Agency's technical co-operation programmes. Owing to Agency policy changes, that proportion had then declined. India hoped that the downward trend would be reversed under the new Director General.

83. The methodology employed in preparing regional programmes in the nuclear power and nuclear fuel cycle areas should perhaps be reassessed with a view to making better use of scarce resources. Such an exercise might result in "regional programme frameworks" for nuclear power development in South-East and Central Asia, Eastern Europe and North Africa.

84. Special attention should be paid to regional model projects, particularly in relation to the development and sharing of nuclear power infrastructures in Asia, Eastern Europe and North Africa. Governments should be involved in such projects irrespective of their national plans for nuclear power development so that regional problems relating to - inter alia - the transport of nuclear fuel, liability, the storage of waste and emergency preparedness might be efficiently addressed.

85. Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) said that Agency technical co-operation was of crucial importance in enlarging the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world in line with Article II of the Statute.

86. Iraq, which had on numerous occasions stressed the need to ensure that the financing of Agency technical co-operation was placed on a sound footing, believed that it should be financed from the Regular Budget and not be dependent on voluntary contributions.

87. There were currently five technical co-operation projects (in the areas of medicine and agriculture) under way in Iraq, but their implementation had been greatly delayed because the necessary equipment had not been delivered owing to the continuing operation of sanctions. His delegation would like the Secretariat to do all it could to expedite the delivery of that equipment.

88. Mr. CASTERTON (Canada), commending the Department of Technical Co-operation for all it had done to strengthen Agency technical co-operation, urged it to continue with its efforts to form partnerships with funding organizations and establish appropriate joint project mechanisms.

89. The sustainability of technical co-operation projects was important, and Canada would be happy to continue assisting the Agency in that connection. At present, the Canadian International Development Agency was assessing the impact of the eradication of the tsetse fly in Zanzibar - achieved through an Agency technical co-operation project - on animal production there.

90. Canada believed that broadening the base of contributors to the TCF would help ensure that the Agency's resources for technical co-operation activities were assured, predictable and sufficient. It was therefore pleased that more countries were contributing, or had indicated their intention to contribute, to the TCF.

91. His country was pleased with recent developments regarding the payment of assessed programme costs. By paying those costs, recipient countries demonstrated their commitment to the projects to which the costs related.

92. Finally, Canada supported the idea of an efficiency/impact review of a sample of technical co-operation projects for the purpose of determining whether donors and recipients were getting value for money. The costs associated with such a review should be taken into account in its design.

93. Mr. Dae-Shik JO (Republic of Korea), referring to operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution in document GC(42)/COM.5/3, said his delegation would like the Secretariat to consult more intensively with Member States on the question of regional centres of excellence.

94. Mr. SHOAIB (Pakistan) said that the Agency had a responsibility to facilitate technology transfer in areas where nuclear techniques had the edge over conventional techniques.

95. Given the recent difficulties with technical co-operation financing, TCDC was assuming greater significance. In the interests of TCDC, his country was ready to make available advanced institutions as centres of excellence in nuclear engineering, nuclear medicine and agricultural applications.

96. His delegation hoped that the Department of Technical Co-operation would implement the recommendations made by SAGTAC late in 1997 and that it would ensure that the Agency's technical co-operation activities benefited from greater involvement and support on the part of all relevant technical Divisions of the Agency.

97. Mr. MCINTOSH (Australia), having noted that his country's priorities in the technical co-operation field were poverty reduction and sustainable development, said that the emphasis in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in document GC(42)/COM.5/3 on the continued promotion of nuclear power did not accord well with the emphasis in operative paragraph 4 on the needs of least developed countries, for which nuclear power had little relevance.

98. As regards operative paragraph 6, in his delegation's view the identification of regional centres of excellence was primarily a matter for the countries party to the various regional agreements.

99. Mr. ARAR (Turkey) said his delegation was in favour of the General Conference's adopting the draft resolution.

100. Mr. GOLDMAN (United States of America) said his delegation was pleased with the Secretariat's continuing efforts to strengthen the Agency's technical co-operation activities and looked forward to examining the proposed technical co-operation programme

for 1999-2000, which - it hoped - would provide evidence that the introduction of model projects had led to major and permanent improvements.

101. The commitment of his country to Agency technical co-operation was shown by the fact that it was the largest contributor to the TCF and had been making large additional contributions in support of the Agency's technical co-operation activities. The United States would continue to support Agency technical co-operation to the extent that its resources allowed.

102. His delegation found the draft resolution under consideration somewhat disappointing in that it did not include any references to the initiatives already taken to strengthen the Agency's technical co-operation activities - for example, the introduction of model projects and thematic planning.

103. Referring to the comments made by the representative of India about the proportion of the Agency's technical co-operation programmes which was accounted for by projects relating to nuclear power and the nuclear fuel cycle, he said that those programmes were essentially a response to requests made by Member States; there had simply been a decline in the number of requests for projects relating to nuclear power and the nuclear fuel cycle. Operative subparagraph 3(b) did not reflect the interests of the vast majority of recipient Member States as evidenced by project requests.

104. He proposed that: in preambular paragraph (k) the phrase "to implement the Technical Co-operation Strategy (GOV/INF/824), including an emphasis on sustainable development and improved project design and evaluation" be added after "document GC(42)/INF/4"; the words "and, in this regard, expresses appreciation to the Secretariat for elaboration of the Technical Co-operation Strategy" be added at the end of operative paragraph 1; in operative paragraph 2 the phrase "undertake discussions at an appropriate time" be substituted for "continue further negotiations" and the phrase "with a perspective of increase" be deleted. He also proposed the insertion of an operative paragraph 3 reading as follows: "Urges all Member States to make every effort to pay in full and on time their contributions to the Technical Co-operation Fund, as well as to pay Assessed Programme Costs".

105. The CHAIRMAN suggested that any further proposals for amendments to the draft resolution be submitted in writing to the Secretariat.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.